REMARKS

Claims 1-21 and 23-37 are pending.

Claims 1-21 and 23-37 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 16, and 32-37 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Support for these amendments can be found, at least, within paragraphs [0019] and [0020] of the specification.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Page 2 of the Office Action states that independent claim 1 recites the terms "the processor" and there is purportedly insufficient antecedent and basis for this limitation. Applicants have amended this claim and respectfully submit that this rejection is now overcome.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,804,657 ("Sultan") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,516,106 ("Ehlers"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Sultan nor Ehlers, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 1, including, generating a forecast snapshot comprising both a forecast and forecast summary information for the forecast. Claims 16 and 32 have all been amended to recite limitations containing similar features to the forecast snapshots in claim 1.

The Office Action cites Ehlers as disclosing generating a report to view historical information, such as a monthly temperature report. *See* Office Action, p. 6. Applicants respectfully submit that Ehlers's report is generated using raw underlying information, where the raw underlying information is the individual temperature readings. Office Action, p. 6 (citing Ehlers 7:40-45, 10:42-55, 12:4-22, 45:33-67, 50:9-24, and Figures 4K-4M and 5H-5I). As will be appreciated by one of skill in the art, there is a clear distinction, by definition, between raw data and information about the raw data, as one is

data, and the other, metadata. Thus, raw data and information about the raw data differ in the same way that data is distinct from metadata. Thus, Applicants submit that the claimed forecast snapshot includes two distinct types of data constructs, forecast information (raw data) and summary information about the forecast (metadata).

Further demonstrating the difference between raw information and summary information about the raw information are the advantages provided by the claimed invention. When the plurality of forecast snapshots are used to display forecasting information to a user, each of the individual forecast snapshots already includes information about the forecast in the form of the summary information. Thus, when the forecast information is generated using the plurality of forecast snapshots, there is no need for summary information for the underlying forecasts to be generated because this has already been done. Further, not only is the summary information present within the forecast snapshots, if any individual pieces of underlying forecast information are required, the forecast snapshots also contain this type of information. As explained in the specification, this may be the case when a user "drills down" into the forecasting information in order to reach underlying information. *See, e.g.*, Application, ¶ [0020].

Another way to understand the difference between these data constructs present within a forecast snapshot is to note that there is a cost associated with their storage. An ordinary artisan would not add additional overhead to a system if there were not some benefit that would be reaped in return. In the case of the claimed method, by having a forecast snapshot store both one or more forecasts and summary information about those forecasts, it is possible to more efficiently produce results derived from the various summaries within the plurality of forecast snapshots. If there were no need to generate forecast information that did not derive from the summary information, the additional cost of having a forecast snapshot include summary information about such forecasts would make little sense.

Even in light of Ehlers' disclosure, an ordinary artisan would not consider keeping track of anything other than the underlying raw information (temperature readings) because the result desired is simply one or more selected calculations of the raw information (*e.g.* high, low, and average temperatures). In other words, Ehlers fails to comprehend any concept even remotely comparable to a second level of information

processing (*i.e.* a meta level). Further, not only does Ehlers fail to do so, Ehlers does not store both of any two types of data constructs within a third construct, and certainly nothing comparable to a forecast snapshot. Further still, Ehlers cannot be characterized as disclosing the derivation of any information from a structure storing both types of data constructs, as claimed.

The Office Action concedes that Sultan fails to disclose the forecast snapshot feature and the plurality of forecast snapshots. *See* Office Action, p. 5. Without disclosing either of these two features, it follows that Sultan must also fail to disclose the current limitations that further specify the composition of a forecast snapshot.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that neither Sultan nor Ehlers, alone or in combination, provide disclosure of all the limitations of claims 1, 16, and 32 and that these claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to these claims.

Application No.: 10/731,696

CONCLUSION

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, the Application and claims are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicants hereby petition for such extensions. Applicants also hereby authorize that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to Deposit Account 502306.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.8 on _____7/19/2010_____ by being transmitted via the USPTO's electronic filing system.

/ Samuel G. Campbell, III / .   7/19/2010
_____   _____
  Samuel G. Campbell, III   Date

Respectfully submitted,

/ Samuel G. Campbell, III /

Samuel G. Campbell, III
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,381
512-439-5084
512-439-5099 (fax)